



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,015	07/16/2003	Isador H. Lieberman	CCF-6387	9116
26294	7590	10/26/2006		
TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P. 1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700 CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114			EXAMINER SHAFFER, RICHARD R	
			ART UNIT 3733	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/621,015	Applicant(s) LIEBERMAN, ISADOR H.	
	Examiner Richard R. Shaffer	Art Unit 3733	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15-33 and 35-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 24, 30, 33, 36, 53 and 54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>FR2627558A1 Reference</u> . |

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are 3-5,9,10,12,13,15,16,18-20,22,23,25-32,35 and 37-52.

DETAILED ACTION***Specification***

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. It is suggested that a new title includes the idea of using helical spikes in bone attachment.

Double Patenting

The double patenting rejection in the Office Action mailed on December 14th, 2006 contained a typographical error. Instead of the stated 6,517,774 patent number, it should have been 6,527,774. Therefore, the previous double patenting rejection is hereby vacated. A new terminal disclaimer will be required at no cost to applicant for correcting the mistake in regard to the 6,517,774. However, additional double patenting rejections are to follow.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 3733

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 24, 30, 33, 36, 53 and 54 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over:

Claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,488,683

Claims 1-10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,468,309

Claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,551,322

Claims 1-40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,544,265

Claims 1-82 of U.S. Patent No. 6,551,319

Claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,551,320

Claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,168

Claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,527,774

Claims 1-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,953,462

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the difference between the application claims and the patent claims lies in the fact that the patent claims include more elements and thus more specific. Thus the invention of the patent claims are in effect a "species" of the "generic" invention of the application claims. It has been held that the generic invention is "anticipated" by the "species." See *In re Goodman*, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Objections

The amendments to claims filed on August 14th, 2006 are acknowledged and accepted by the examiner. The corresponding claim objections are hereby withdrawn.

Art Unit: 3733

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The amendments to claims filed on August 14th, 2006 are acknowledged and accepted by the examiner. The corresponding claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In claims 1 and 53, applicant recites "a distal end which penetrates into bone." This is positively reciting a portion of the human body. It is recommended applicant add capable of language such as employed in claim 21 to correct for this deficiency. All dependent claims are rejected due to being dependent upon a non-statutory base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 24, 30, 33, 36, 53 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boldue et al (US Patent 5,582,616).

Boldue et al disclose (**Figures 2A-3C and 6-14**) a device comprising: an anchor (**110, Figure 2A**) having a platform (**122**); two helical spikes with proximal/connecting portion (**118**) and distal ends/tip portion (**120**) and an intermediate portion inbetween; the helical spikes having a solid cross-section of cylindrical shape and constant diameter; and a sleeve (**36**) for inserting the anchor.

In regard to limitations for intended use, the device is inherently capable of being inserted into bone to perform the functional language claimed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 21, 24, 30, 33, 36, 53 and 54 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard R. Shaffer whose telephone number is 571-272-8683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7am-5pm).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Richard Shaffer
October 24th, 2006



EDUARDO C. ROBERT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER